For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD ALVARADO, et al.,

No. C 04-0098 SI

Plaintiffs,

ORDER UNSEALING DOCUMENTS RELATED TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

By order filed August 8, 2007, the Court directed the parties to show cause why documents related to defendant's motion for sanctions should not be unsealed. Defendant's response concedes that the documents do not fall within any of the categories of documents specified by the Local Rules as appropriate for sealing. However, defendant requests that the documents remain sealed because plaintiffs' counsel, Mr. McCoy, has threatened to file a lawsuit regarding allegedly defamatory statements contained in the motion for sanctions and related administrative motions.

Plaintiffs' response asserts that the documents at issue should remain sealed because they are "otherwise entitled to protection under the law." Although the asserted legal basis for such protection is unclear, plaintiff contends that the documents are "libelous," and should remain sealed to protect Mr. McCoy from embarrassment.

The Court finds that parties have failed to demonstrate that the documents should remain sealed, and accordingly UNSEALS the documents related to defendant's motion for sanctions (Docket Nos. 817, 837, 867-869, 885 and 908). Neither party has shown that the documents are privileged or otherwise entitled to protection under the law as required by Civil Local Rule 79-5. The reasons asserted by the parties – protection against embarrassment and a fear of being sued – do not outweigh

Case 3:04-cv-00098-SI Document 927 Filed 09/10/07 Page 2 of 2

For the Northern District of California

United States District Court

the public's interest in these proceedings and the general presumption in favor of public access to court
files. Further, the Court is skeptical that the documents at issue could give rise to a defamation lawsuit;
in the Court's view such a lawsuit would be frivolous due to, <i>inter alia</i> , the litigation privilege.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:	September	10,	2007
--------	-----------	-----	------

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge